

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

VIOLET GOODWIN,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CITY OF OMAHA, et al.,

Defendants.

8:21-CV-417

ORDER


The plaintiff has objected ([filing 88](#)) to the Magistrate Judge's order ([filing 87](#)) denying what the Magistrate Judge construed as a motion for protective order ([filing 85](#)) and motion for contempt ([filing 86](#)). The plaintiff's objection states only: "We appeal all of the May 8th 2023 decision of Judge Cheryl Schwartz [sic]." [Filing 88](#).

But this Court's rules provide that a party objecting to a Magistrate Judge's order "must specify (1) the parts of the order or findings and recommendations to which the party objects and (2) the legal basis of the objections." [NECivR 72.1\(a\)](#). Even if an objection to "all" of an order can be construed as sufficiently specifying the parts of the order to which the plaintiff objects, there is nothing to explain the legal basis for the objection. Because the plaintiff did not comply with this Court's rules,

IT IS ORDERED that the plaintiff's objection ([filing 88](#)) is overruled.

Dated this 26th day of May, 2023.

BY THE COURT:



John M. Gerrard
Senior United States District Judge